



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/501,171

09/27/2004

Robert M. Winslow

XSAN-1034865

7868

7590  
Laurie A. Axford  
Gordon & Rees LLP  
Suite 1600  
101 West Broadway  
San Diego, CA 92101

03/14/2007

EXAMINER

ROBINSON, HOPE A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1652

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

03/14/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/501,171	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WINSLOW ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Hope A. Robinson	<b>Art Unit</b> 1652	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 1652

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Application Status***

1. The Art Unit location of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 1652.
2. Applicant's response to the Office Action mailed September 22, 2006 on December 22, 2006 is acknowledged.

### ***Claim Disposition***

3. Claims 1-4 and 7 are pending and are under examination.

### ***Withdrawn-Specification Objection***

4. Previous objections to the specification are withdrawn by virtue of submission of an amendment.

### ***Maintained-Basis For NonStatutory Double Patenting***

Art Unit: 1652

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1-4 remain rejected under the judicially created doctrine obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3, 5 and 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,974,795. An obvious-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but an examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); and *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225

Art Unit: 1652

*USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985)*. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

The instant application claim is directed to a blood substitute composition comprising a modified hemoglobin and aqueous diluent. The claimed invention also encompasses a plasma from animal species, at least one polyalkylene oxide molecule and polyethylene glycol and a P50 less than native stroma-free. The patented claims are directed to a blood substitute product having a P50 less than native stroma-free, derived from animal source (horse) with PEG and having polyalkylene oxide. The two sets of claims differ as the instant claim recites "at least 40% plasma". However, the specification of the patent discloses the same.

Although the scope of the claims herein differs, the two sets of claims are directed to similar inventions as the claim language has the same material. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to modify the patented claims to recite, for example the species that contained in the genus as disclosed in the specification and one of which is recited in the instant application claims because it clarifies the claim by providing the specific species. Thus, the instant claims are an obvious variation of the patented claims, therefore *prima facie* obvious.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 1652

7. Claims 1-4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claimed invention is directed to a blood substitute composition comprising a PEG surface-modified hemoglobin, however, the claims are described by functional means and no structural limitation is present in the claims. A skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the products encompassed in the claims. The claims encompass a genus of modified hemoglobin. The instant specification fails to provide a representative number of species for the claimed genus. A representative number of species means that the species, which are adequately described, are representative of the entire genus. Thus the claims lack adequate written description to demonstrate to a skilled artisan that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention. An applicant shows possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, and formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention. See *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir.1997). Therefore, a biomolecule sequence described only by a functional characteristic, without any known or disclosed correlation between that function and the structure of the sequence, normally is not a sufficient identifying characteristic for written description purposes, even when accompanied by a method of obtaining the claimed sequence. For example, even though a genetic code table would correlate a known amino acid sequence with a genus of coding nucleic acids, the same table cannot predict the native, naturally

Art Unit: 1652

occurring nucleic acid sequence of a naturally occurring mRNA or its corresponding cDNA. *See MPEP 2163.*

Further, *Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Fed. Cir.1991), states that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in *possession of the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*" (See page 1117). The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed" (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116). The skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed genus of encoded proteins, and therefore, conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. The compound itself is required. *See Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993). *See MPEP 2163.*

In addition, the claims recite the added material of "stroma-free hemoglobin", however no support was found in the instant specification. The claims contain new matter and is not adequately described because the instant specification at paragraph [0023] for example, discloses that "a stroma-free hemoglobin" refers to hemoglobin from which all red blood cell membranes have been removed. Therefore, for all these reasons the specification lacks adequate written description, and one of skill in the art cannot reasonably conclude that the applicant had possession of the claimed invention at the time the instant application was filed.

***Response to Applicant's Arguments:***

12. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered. Note however, that the rejection of record under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph remains for the reasons stated above and herein. The claims read on a structure such as the following found in the U.S. Patent No:6974795 among others, thus applicant is urged to clarify the claims with a formula or structure: Hb-(S--Y--R--CH.sub.2 --CH.sub.2 [O--CH.sub.2 --CH.sub.2 ].sub.n O--CH.sub.3).sub.m

wherein Hb is a tetrameric hemoglobin; S is a surface thiol group; Y is a succinimide covalent link between hemoglobin and Mal-PEG; R is an alkyl; [O--CH.sub.2 --CH.sub.2 ].sub.n are oxyethylene units making up the backbone of the PEG; and O--CH.sub.3 is a terminal methoxy group.

In addition, the claims recite a "stroma-free hemoglobin" instead of a "stroma-free hemoglobin", thus the amendment introduces new matter, since no support is found in the specification for said phraseology. In addition, note that the Obvious-type double patenting rejection remains because no terminal disclaimer was attached as indicated by applicant.

***Conclusion***

13. No claims are allowable.

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new/modified ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).



A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hope A. Robinson whose telephone number is 571-272-0957. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapu Achutamurthy, can be reached at (571) 272-0928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/501,171

Page 9

Art Unit: 1652

Hope Robinson, MS ~~AA~~

Primary Examiner

3/10/07

HOPE ROBINSON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER